



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/763,588	01/23/2004	Thomas Gehrke	013921-000026	7739

24239 7590 05/05/2006

MOORE & VAN ALLEN PLLC
P.O. BOX 13706
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

EXAMINER

GUERRERO, MARIA F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2822

DATE MAILED: 05/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to the Request for continued examination filed March 23, 2006.

Status of Claims

2. Claims 1-48 are pending.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on March 23, 2006 has been entered.

Election/Restrictions

4. Applicant's election of Group I (claims 1-29) in the reply filed on November 18, 2004 is acknowledged. Because applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).
5. Claims 30-48 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b) as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or

Art Unit: 2822

linking claim. Election was made **without** traverse in the reply filed on November 18, 2004.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

6. Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,261,929.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the subject matter recited by the claims is covered by claims 17 of U.S. Patent No. 6,261,929.

7. Claims 1-29 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-9 and 11-30 of U.S. Patent No. 6,376,339 in view of Marx et al. (US 5,880,485). Claims 1-9 and 11-30 of U.S. Patent No. 6,376,339 discloses all the steps as claimed except for the substrate being

Art Unit: 2822

sapphire. Marx et al. teaches forming a gallium nitride layer on a sapphire substrate as well known in the art (Fig. 2C, col. 8, lines 10-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include the sapphire substrate in claims 1-29 of U.S. Patent No. 6,376,339 as taught by Marx et al. because SiC and sapphire are materials recognized as being interchangeable in the process of forming gallium nitride layers (Marx et al., col. 8, lines 10-18).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Murakami et al. "Growth of Si-doped ALGAN on (0001) sapphire substrate by metalorganic vapor phase epitaxy" and Mishra et al. (US 5,795,798) teaches that growing gallium nitride layers on sapphire substrates is well known in the art.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Maria Guerrero whose telephone number is 571-272-1837.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zandra Smith can be reached on 571-272-2429. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

May 1, 2006

Maria Guerrero
MARIA F. GUERRERO
PRIMARY EXAMINER